



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 09/105,830	FILING DATE 07/02/98	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR KENNELLY J	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. KE27-001
-------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

WELLS ST JOHN ROBERTS  
GREGORY & MATKIN  
601 W FIRST AVENUE 1300  
SOPKANE WA 92201-3828

QM21/0914

EXAMINER DEXTER, E
-----------------------

ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 09/14/00 *12*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/109,830

Applicant(s)

Kennelly et al.

Examiner

Clark F. Dexter

Group Art Unit

3724



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. James Price

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 12, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement. ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 11

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Price called for clarification of the recent Miscellaneous Office action. Mr. Dexter explained that it is still not clear as to what the term "working flights" refers. Mr. Price stated that the term is well known, particularly in the conveying arts, wherein it refers to a work-bearing portion, as opposed to a return portion, of a conveying device; for example, the upper, fence-advancing portion of the chain, as opposed to the lower return portion of the chain of the present invention. Regarding the objection in the Misc. Office action directed to claim 11, the Examiner stated that further consideration would be given to this issue, and that no amendments regarding this issue are necessary at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

CLARK F. DEXTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3724

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.